

Attorney Docket No. NC17054

Remarks

The Examiner has rejected claims 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the limitation in claim 8 "said input circuitry" lacks antecedent basis. The Examiner also rejected claims 1-13 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of US Patent 6,199,158.

Applicant has amended claim 8 so that the limitation "said input circuitry" has been changed to "said input device". There is clear antecedent basis for "said input device" as this was the way the claim was originally intended to read. Applicant has also filed a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(b) to overcome the double patenting rejection.

Applicant now believes the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the Examiner grant allowance of the application.

No new matter has been added.

Respectfully submitted,

Applicant

Date: 10/28/03

By: B. T. Rivers

Brian T. Rivers, Reg. No. 41,270
Attorney for Applicant
972-894-4959/ Fax 972-894-5619

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

OCT 28 2003

OFFICIAL